

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,335,776).

Claims 16, 19, 20, 22, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 2001/0019388).

Claims 13, 14, 17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 6,100,953).

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Rhee et al. (US 6,140,158).

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US '953) and Suzuki et al. (US 2002/0080320).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 19 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are pending for consideration.

Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-12 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (US 6,335,776), claims 16, 19, 20, 22, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 2001/0019388), claims 13, 14, 17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US 6,100,953), claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Rhee et al. (US 6,140,158), and claim 15

stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. ('776) in view of Kim et al. (US '953) and Suzuki et al. (US 2002/0080320). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24.

Initially, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner's position that "[n]ote fig. 20A is considered to be the same embodiment as fig. 2A or 6A as it is the only figure that shows cross section showing the individual layers of the LCD since the same layer structure can be applied to either embodiment (2A or 6A)" is clearly wrong. First, Kim et al. ('776) simply does not make any disclosure that FIG. 20A and any of FIGs. 2A and 6A are related. Second, the logical reasoning set forth by the Examiner is incorrect based upon the fact that the structures shown in FIGs. 2A and 6A of Kim et al. ('776) are not disclosed as be related to the structure shown in FIG. 20A. Third, Kim et al. ('776) explicitly discloses that FIGs. 3A and 3B are cross-sectional views along lines I-I' and II-II' of FIG. 2A. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the presumption made by the Examiner is incorrect.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including, in part, "a plurality of side electrodes overlapping the data lines along a length direction of the data lines, the side electrode in the pixel being extended to a neighboring pixel," wherein "a width of the side electrode is greater than a width of the data lines." Similarly, independent claim 10, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display panel including, in part, "a plurality of side electrodes formed on a surface of the second insulating layer to overlap the data lines along a length direction of the data lines, the side electrode in the pixel being extended to a neighboring pixel,"

wherein “a width of the side electrode is greater than a width of the data lines.” Likewise, independent claim 19, as amended, recites a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display panel including, in part, a step of “forming a plurality of side electrodes extending along a length direction of the data lines and overlapping the data lines by patterning the transparent conductive material, the side electrode in the pixel being extended to a neighboring pixel,” wherein “a width of the side electrode is greater than a width of the data lines.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Kim et al. (‘776) explicitly teaches, in FIGs. 3A and 3B, that side electrodes 15 are disposed spaced apart from the data lines 3, and that the side electrodes 15 do not overlap the data lines 3 along a length direction of the data lines 3. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Kim et al. (‘776) is completely silent with regard to the side electrodes 15 having a width greater than the data lines 3.

Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Kim et al. (‘388), Kim et al. (‘953), Rhee et al., and Suzuki et al., whether taken singly or combined, can remedy the deficiencies of Kim et al. (‘776) since none of Kim et al. (‘388), Kim et al. (‘953), Rhee et al., and Suzuki et al. teach or suggest the structural features now recited by amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-24.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: September 30, 2005

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000